UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

A STATEMENT OF AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY - - - *Salmon O. Levinson*

A SUBSTITUTE FOR THE LUDLOW AMENDMENT - *David Rhys Williams*

BEFORE THE NAVAL AFFAIRS COMMITTEE - *Lola Maverick Lloyd*

VOLUME CXXI NUMBER 1

Chicago, March 7, 1938

PRICE FIFTEEN CENTS

UNITY

Established 1878

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918)

Published Semi-Monthly Until Further Notice — *Subscription $3.00 Single Copies 15 cents*

UNITY PUBLISHING CO., Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago, Ill.

"Entered as Second-Class Matter May 24, 1935, at the Post Office at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879."

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, *Editor* — CURTIS W. REESE, *Managing Editor*

Board of Directors

MRS. S. O. LEVINSON, President
MRS. E. L. LOBDELL, Vice-President
MRS. IRWIN S. ROSENFELS, Treasurer
MRS. FRANCIS NEILSON
MRS. O. T. KNIGHT
MR. C. W. REESE
MISS MATILDA C. SCHAFF
MRS. E. E. SMITH
MR. FRANCIS NEILSON
MRS. IDA S. RANDALL
MR. JAMES E. TUCKER

Editorial Contributors

W. WALDEMAR W. ARGOW
DOROTHY WALTON BINDER
RAYMOND B. BRAGG
TARAKNATH DAS
PERCY M. DAWSON
ALBERT C. DIEFFENBACH
JAMES A. FAIRLEY
ZONA GALE
A. EUSTACE HAYDON
JESSE H. HOLMES
LOUIS L. MANN
JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE
H. R. MUSSEY
M. C. OTTO
ALSON H. ROBINSON
ROBERT C. SCHALLER
FRED W. SHORTER
CLARENCE R. SKINNER
SYDNEY STRONG
ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY

Poetry Editors

LUCIA TRENT
RALPH CHEYNEY

Washington Correspondent

BRENT DOW ALLINSON

Foreign Representatives

AUSTRALIA—CHARLES STRONG
AUSTRIA—STEFAN ZWEIG
BULGARIA—P. M. MATTHÉEFF
ENGLAND—HARRISON BROWN
FRED HANKINSON
REGINALD REYNOLDS
FRANCE—G. DEMARTIAL
ROMAIN ROLLAND
GERMANY—THEODOR HAHN
INDIA—RABINDRANATH TAGORE
JAPAN—NOBUICHIRO IMAOKA
PALESTINE—HANS KOHN
RUSSIA—ALINA HUEBSCH

Contents

EDITORIAL—
Notes 3
Jottings—J. H. H. 5
ARTICLES—
A Statement of American Foreign Policy—SALMON O. LEVINSON 6
Is This Neighborliness?—MIRIAM ZIONY 7
The Pacifist Movement in France—CAMILLE DREVET 8
Before the Naval Affairs Committee—LOLA MAVERICK LLOYD .. 9
A Substitute for the Ludlow Amendment—
DAVID RHYS WILLIAMS 10
Arms of the Law—O. A. HAMMAND 11
War in Wonderland—WILLIAM FLOYD 13
THE STUDY TABLE—
What Is Ahead of Us?—R. LESTER MONDALE 12
Toward International Good Will—LUCIA TRENT 12
The Statesmanship of Peace—GEORGE MAYCHIN STOCKDALE 13
CORRESPONDENCE—
In Behalf of World Government—EDITH WYNNER 14
Three Notable Women—SYDNEY STRONG 14
Coöperation—H. POSNER 14
Mr. Justice Black—ROBERT WHITAKER 14
THE FIELD—
Report on the Problem of Refugees—*Pax International* 2
To the "Men Who Matter"—"DICK" SHEPPARD 15
The Harriet Wells Scholarship—*English Speaking Union* 15

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

Report on the Problem of Refugees

By E. M. PYE

The problem of the refugees who are the victims of great political upheavals or of the intolerance of arbitrary governments, and whose protection is an essential function of an organized society of nations becomes more and more complicated as ideas of government by force and violence take root and flourish in new soil.

Great hopes had been aroused that the 1937 Assembly of the League of Nations would recognize the urgent nature of the problem and agree to all refugees coming under its protection instead of being dealt with outside its framework, as is now the case. There are at present two main bodies, the Nansen Office and the High Commission for refugees from Germany, both of which are to be terminated at the end of this year, and one or two other committees such as that dealing with the Assyrians, but there is no provision for the assistance of other categories of refugees, such as those from Spain, Italy, Poland or Roumania.

It was a great blow when the resolution, making plans towards the unification and continuation of the work for refugees which was strongly supported by many governments, including the British, was opposed in the 6th Commission by the Russian delegate. An amendment was brought in by certain members referring the whole question to the Council for re-examination and for the preparation of plans for the 1938 Assembly. This was done in the hope of avoiding an adverse vote in the Assembly and in the Finance Committee, since the whole work at present undertaken by the Nansen Office would come to an end at once without the supplementary credit needed of about £5,000. The amendment was accepted by the 6th Commission and sent to the Assembly in place of the original resolution. It was passed without any opposing vote, though only twenty-five countries voted for it. It was the opinion of some governments that it would have been better to force the Russian delegate to oppose this humanitarian measure in full Assembly—but such action would have made future progress impossible and there is some hope of a modification in the Russian attitude before the next Assembly which will decide the fate of the League's work for refugees.

The Nansen Office, under its President, Judge Michael Hansson, continues to struggle heroically with the problem of the permanent settlement of Armenians and Russian refugees and of reorganization of its work. No one will ever know of the thousands of individual refugees who have been saved by it from misery and despair that would make death welcome.

Refugees from Germany

A certain number of these have found shelter and a new home and write happily, but there are many whose future is still dark. A Convention for their protection has now been drafted from the provisional arrangement accepted previously. This Convention has been submitted to Governments whose representatives are to

(*Continued on page* 15)

UNITY

"He Hath Made of One All Nations of Men"

Volume CXXI MONDAY, MARCH 7, 1938 No. 1

BEWARE, JAPAN, BEWARE!

Beware, Japan, beware!
The hour of Empire wanes.
Though, for a moment, everywhere
On land and sea, and in the air
War shrieks its madness and despair,
The larger freedom gains.

The world must needs be one,
But never one shall rule.
The bomb will fail as failed the gun,
As failed the spears of Babylon,
All lawless might at last undone,
Whoever plays the fool.

Though League on League arise
To foul the Earth with blood,
Destruction by destruction dies;
All lies are lost at last in lies;
But he who runs may read the skies
Sure pledge of brotherhood.

—Robert Whitaker.

ANGELS AND DEVILS

"Once more," says *World Events,* "the world is divided into angels and devils." It is, indeed! Just as it was yesterday, when the Kaiser was the devil, as Hitler and Mussolini are now devils—and we, of course, as always, angels! But *World Events* declares that it does "not propose to be fooled by high-sounding phrases as to the realities of the 'next war' "—"Fascist aggressors," "sanctity of treaties," "international law," etc.—all based on this angel and devil theory of history. Neither does UNITY! We agree absolutely with *World Events* when the editor writes that *"the 'next war' will be the same old imperialism for the protection of foreign trade, foreign investments, and colonial possessions."* Stick this in your hat, and take it out when we go to war with those "devils" in Japan, or Italy, or Germany, as the case may be! All the talk, even now, is that we must "fight the Fascists," and save the world from the mad dogs. That of course is the way it will be put when the war comes. But Sir Anthony Eden has already told the House of Commons that Britain will not fight an anti-Fascist war, but will fight "to protect its interests." That's what's behind our vast rearmament program—not defense against Fascism but our "interests." Just what to expect from democratic countries is shown in the fact that, while all this talk of devils and angels is going on, the so-called enemies of Fascism are joyously arming the Fascists. Thus, aerial bombs are steadily being shipped from this country to Germany, where they are re-shipped to Rebel Spain. Every day we are sending tons of arms and scrap-iron to Japan, the fierce barbarian, of whom we pretend to be so much afraid in the Orient. In the Ethiopian war, Italy desperately needed oil, and she got it in vast supplies from Soviet Russia, just as she is now getting it from Russia for Rebel Spain. In all this frantic armament race, French iron ore is pouring in enormous quantities into Germany, there to be turned into arms for the Nazis. Anti-Fascism? "Nobody need be fooled who does not want to be," says *World Events. "The coming war will not be for democracy and against Fascism. It will follow the well-established pattern of imperialistic wars."*

GERMANY AND THE EUROPEAN CRISIS

Now we know the meaning of what went on in Germany when Hitler so suddenly "purged" his army of its officers and his foreign office of its moderates. The upset was not caused by Blomberg's wedding, which was camouflage. It had no connection with the trial of Niemöller, who, so far from threatening Hitler's rule, is, for all his heroism, a mere insect beneath the Fuehrer's heel. It betokened no uprising nor even unrest beneath the surface of German life. We fooled ourselves in thinking that Hitler was suddenly faced by a crisis from within which disclosed weakness and perhaps collapse. Nothing of the sort! The dictator of the Reich had decided that the time was ripe for another smashing *coup*—to take over Austria, as he had formerly taken over the Rhineland; army officers and foreign secretaries hesitated, were frightened, and with one contemptuous fling Hitler cast them into outer darkness, and marched straight to his objective. At the appointed moment, the Austrian Premier was summoned to the Nazi presence, German army corps were marshalled on the Austrian frontier, the ultimatum was delivered—and of course accepted! All of which means that Hitler is stronger today inside of Germany than he has ever been before, and more terrible outside of Germany than at any time since he took power! His February 20th speech was the utterance of a

triumphant man proclaiming to the world what in *Mein Kampf* he had long since defined as his program for the future! Austria, still undevoured, is yet as finally in Hitler's clutches as the fly which becomes entangled in the web of the black spider. Once the filaments of economic, political, and military involvement have been wound 'round and 'round the victim, the spider will spread his web anew—this time to catch Czechoslovakia. As surely as Austria followed the Rhineland, so surely will Czechoslovakia follow Austria, and the Ukraine Czechoslovakia. And with Schacht, the Reichswehr generals, and Von Neurath all gone, the Fuehrer is as absolute in his rule in Berlin as ever was Genghis Khan in his Tartar tent. Mein Gott, mein Gott, what a mess the Great War was in conquering and subduing Germany! And there are those who want to try that war again!!

STALIN'S CHALLENGE TO THE WORKERS OF THE WORLD

Soviet Russia still remains a mystery. How on earth to understand what's going on! We don't wonder that correspondents cite Dostoievsky, refer to the dark Russian temperament, and let it go at that. How explain, for example, this sensational letter of Stalin on world revolution and his call to the workers of all nations to support Russia in the inevitable war against capitalism? Walter Duranty of the New York *Times,* stout champion of the Soviet dictator, calls this letter an example of "perfect timing." But we cannot see it that way! On the contrary, it strikes us that the pronunciamento was issued at just about the worst moment possible. It appeared, for example, on the very day when Hitler was consummating his pro-Nazi agreement with Austria and therewith pulling off the most triumphant diplomatic and military stunt since his occupation of the Rhineland. If ever an international United Front was needed against Fascism, it is at this new crisis of Germany's dominance of Europe. Yet it seems as though this Front were smashed forever, so far as Russia is concerned, for the great democratic nations—Britain, France, America—are certainly not going to tumble over themselves to line up with a country which undertakes bluntly to declare revolutionary hostilities against their institutions. It strikes us that Stalin's move has created a complete rift through which the Fascist gang can drive like a coach and six. And what about the United Front at home—the move fostered by Moscow for some time past to unite all liberal, progressive, and labor forces in a solid phalanx against Fascist tendencies in domestic society and politics? From the beginning the reactionaries have insisted that this United Front is but a disguise for what they call subversive Communist activities. And now Stalin comes along with his appeal for world revolution to sustain this embarrassing charge! Walter Duranty declares that Stalin's letter was made necessary, or at least advisable, by conditions in Russia. If so, the gain at home is seriously counterbalanced by the loss abroad. What has happened is worse confusion among the forces of freedom in the world, and this seems not only a pity but a peril.

ARE THE PEOPLE REBELLING?

To our astonishment and vast delight, opposition of formidable proportions is rolling up against the President's armament program. In our last issue we spoke of public indifference, and now see that we did not allow for the slow start which any popular movement must make. It takes times to get the tides of sentiment moving. But they are moving now all right, and we learn that the administration is terribly concerned. Here was another move expected to be enthusiastically received and supported, especially as taking people's minds off the troubles of the depression. It is so much happier to think of military glory abroad than of economic collapse at home! But it hasn't acted that way—not a bit of it! After the first genuine alarm, the citizens of the country have reacted in resentment and indignation, and the White House wheel-horses are amazingly and amazedly asking if the Bill can be passed. The hearings of the House committee, for example, were a revelation. Expected to be purely perfunctory, they brought forth opposition, led by such men as Professor Charles A. Beard, Bruce Bliven, editor of the *New Republic,* and Frederick J. Libby, which shook the Capitol. Then the letters came pouring in—such an avalanche as Washington has not seen since the ill-starred court-packing plan. Senators spoke out—Borah, LaFollette, Nye, Johnson. And the fight is on! That the Bill can be defeated seems to us something more than a reasonable hope. The people of America are simply opposed to war, and everything that has to do with war. They stirred not at all in response to the President's sensationally jingoistic Chicago speech. They turned not a hair over the *Panay* incident. And now they are mad over this armament program which is based on no foreign policy, involves crushing taxes, and offers the threat of war on foreign soil. We are convinced that the President has guessed wrong again. At any rate, the turn against the big armament bill is significant. The munition-makers don't quite run this country yet!

"NO BOMBING OF CIVILIANS BY U. S. ARMY"

It was a cheerful sight to see this announcement in the headlines the other day. It made us proud of our country. Then, when we read the despatch under the headlines (New York *Times,* February 14, page 1), we began to grow cold again. "American military airplanes, in the event of war, will not bomb civilians," we read. "Strategists of the general staff and the air

corps have so decided, *not for humanitarian reasons,* but because their study of tactics and results in China, in Spain, and in Ethiopia, indicates the game is not worth the candle." The despatch then went on to say that investigations have been carried on "with the professional's detachment from the question of rights and wrongs involved," and the conclusion reached that killing non-combatant men, women, and children from the air produces "no military advantage comparable to the cost to the attacker." The logic of this, if we carry it through, is pretty terrible—as terrible as anything we have seen of late. For all this means that, *if* the bombing of civilians *were* profitable, if it were found that it *did* pay to murder the innocents indiscriminately, *then* the U. S. army would go right ahead and plan the butchery. Nothing could be more explicit than the assumption in this despatch that "humanitarian reasons"—i. e., considerations—have no place in the modern science of war. The army or navy expert must look on every problem with utter "detachment," and make decision on tactical and strategic, not ethical grounds. Any horror "goes," in other words, if it does the business of winning the war! Of course, we have known this all along. Everything done in the Great War, and since, has established this ghastly truth. But there is something about this announcement, as affecting our own army, which seems particularly shocking. De Quincey was nearer the truth than he imagined when he penned his satirical essay on "Murder as a Fine Art." In war, if not yet in personal affairs, murder is today the finest of the fine arts. How to kill with a maximum of effectiveness is the basic question of the hour.

A PIONEER AND PROPHET

John Graham Brooks has died, at an age beyond the ninetieth milestone. His speaking and writing ended years ago, but his influence is still potent. Many a man walking bravely on a broad highway does not know that he is treading what was once a trail blazed painfully by Mr. Brooks through a wilderness of ignorance, prejudice and fear. This man started his public life as a Unitarian clergyman. Way back in the days when the social question in religion, as we know it in our time, had scarcely been heard of, John Graham Brooks discovered it, and made it central in his youthful ministry. Speedily he found himself face to face with a dilemma. Should he stay in the ministry and fight the battle for a socialized Christianity, or should he go right out into the field of industry and labor, and make the social cause his own? It was his scholarly instincts, we have always thought, his desire to master the material and speak directly with authority, that persuaded him to leave the ministry, as he did voluntarily, and become an exponent of social thought. For a generation he led the van. He fought for labor when it was disreputable to do so. He preached trade unionism when the idea was flatly confused with anarchy. He studied and interpreted the I. W. W. movement when passion against it was fiercer than passion today against the "Reds." He discovered the Scandinavian countries while they were still unknown as model examples of socialized democracy, and commended them to the attention of Americans. His books were widely read and are still remembered. His lectures carried him to all parts of the country, to many places where trade unionism was anathema and Socialism a crime. But he was unfailingly patient, kindly, sympathetic, while uncompromisingly clear and candid in his thought, and thus never failed of a hearing. John Graham Brooks was the ablest interpreter of labor's cause in his time. He was the most open-minded man we ever knew. His spirit was as gentle as it was courageous. He was of the true race of pioneers in the realm of thought, a prophet not without honor, and a friend to man.

Jottings

A war for democracy abroad means the destruction of democracy at home.

When the reckoning is made of responsibility for the loss of the Anti-Lynching Bill, the Negroes may well remember that once, twice, thrice, the Bill was lost by a Democratic filibuster which the administration did just nothing at all to oppose.

WPA bulletin boards are now being used to carry enlistment appeals for the army and navy as "an opportunity for security and a career." Thus does the militarization of our government go on apace—depression and unemployment all used as excuses for drumming us into war.

Hitler speaks in Berlin—and a British foreign secretary falls in London. It used to be the other way 'round!

Britain and France, along with Italy, are solemnly bound by treaty pledges to protect the independence of Austria. When Germany browbeat and subdued Austria the other day, neither Britain nor France moved, nor even protested. What are treaty obligations between friends—or enemies? J. H. H.

A Statement of American Foreign Policy*

SALMON O. LEVINSON

1. No alliances nor any military or political commitments in unknown future contingencies with any countries of the Eastern Hemisphere. The American people shall always be free to deal with such contingencies as they may arise, in the interest of justice, right, and liberty.

2. Avoidance as far as possible of involvement in the controversies and conflicts of other nations.

3. America will continue indefinitely to maintain the Monroe Doctrine for the common protection and welfare of herself and her sister nations of the Western Hemisphere, under the principle of the Good Neighbor Policy as enunciated in the recent conferences in South America. We shall be free to make such treaties and commitments and to pursue such measures as may be deemed necessary or desirable to effectuate that policy.

4. Our relations with Canada shall continue permanently on the same basis of mutual respect and friendship, and on the same ideals of peace and justice, as have happily existed between the two nations for more than one hundred years.

5. America will strictly observe in letter and spirit her pledges and obligations under the Briand-Kellogg Treaty renouncing forever the use of war or force for the settlement of any international question or dispute.

6. The bona fide right of self-defense is an inherent and ineradicable moral right. It was not created by law or treaty and it cannot be taken away by law or treaty. But this right of self-defense must not be betrayed into a travesty on common sense and moral conduct. Hence it must be clearly distinguished from the subtle deceptive term "defensive war" which is often used by one belligerent solely to cast the aspersion of "aggression" on its adversary. For when dueling was outlawed the right of individual self-defense necessarily remained, but no confusing distinction was ever attempted to be drawn between "aggressive dueling" and "defensive dueling."

7. At least until all the nations signatory to the Briand-Kellogg Treaty (and none have withdrawn from or renounced it) keep sacred their plighted word to abstain from the use of force in their international relations, it is the policy of America to provide and maintain an army and navy adequate to the defense of our territory, in its broadest sense, and for the preservation of the Monroe Doctrine.

8. In the event of a threatened or actual serious violation of the Briand-Kellogg Treaty (to use the language of the late Secretary of State and leader of the irreconcilables in the League fight, Philander C. Knox, when senator in 1919): "the United States would regard such situation with grave concern as a menace to its own freedom and peace, and would consult with other powers affected." Senator Knox added: "Declared or not, the above is the approved policy of America. With or without any relation whatsoever to the League, American diplomacy can stand upon that policy. On great occasions America will not be found wanting; on little occasions it is far better that America be not distracted from her real work, that the energy needed for national progress be not dissipated in internationalism." In any such crisis and consultation the President or Secretary of State should fully advise the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate and report thereto with the utmost mutual confidence and trust.

9. Long before the Kellogg Pact the United States was the first nation voluntarily to renounce war. In 1898 President McKinley proclaimed that America would fight no war of aggression nor take any spoils of conquest. In 1918 President Wilson reiterated and elaborated this beneficent declaration. And the United States was the first nation to originate, and, in conjunction with France, the first to offer to the world the absolute outlawry and abolition of the barbarous institution of war for the settlement of international controversies. Likewise America was the first nation to declare its refusal to recognize the illegal fruits of conquest, a doctrine that has the highest moral quality and standard, and is indeed a necessary and logical corollary of the Briand-Kellogg Treaty. It also has been the settled policy of the United States not to meddle in the domestic affairs of other nations and not to permit other nations to meddle in our domestic policies.

10. America stands ever ready to join and coöperate with all other nations in a five-year moratorium of armament construction, based on a fair and equitable allotment of defense armaments to each nation. This moratorium alone would save the financially distressed world ten billion dollars a year and a total of fifty billion dollars. During such moratorium period a drastic pro rata reduction of armaments should be worked out and put into effect.

11. In addition, America is willing to aid in promoting a general conference or series of conferences with the nations, to consider and attempt to adjust the grievances and distresses of the peoples of all countries, on a live-and-let-live principle. The purpose would be to reunite the family of nations, to generally widen and expand world trade, to stabilize world currencies, to rid civilization of the physical and economic curse of war, to liquidate as far as practicable the burdensome inheritances of the World War, including a fair readjustment of all allied government war debts. In short the United States would gladly assist in the readjustment of all the maladjustments caused by the ruptures of the greatest war of all time, and to help guide the suffering peoples of the world, including our own, into the path of peace, comfort, and contentment. In this way alone can universal peace be attained. For the flower of peace cannot grow except in the soil of peace; and the world has not culivated the soil of peace since the Great War.

---

*Mr. Levinson was asked by a great newspaper syndicate to formulate a statement of American foreign policy for the current crisis. This statement is here published in full for the first time.—Editor.

Is This Neighborliness?

MIRIAM ZIONY

In a memorable address delivered at Arlington National Cemetery on Armistice Day in 1935, President Roosevelt enunciated his famous Good Neighbor Policy:

> The power of good example is the strongest force in the world. It surpasses preachments, it excels good resolutions, it is better than agreements unfulfilled.
>
> If we as a nation by our good example can contribute to the peaceful well-being of the fellowship of nations, our course through the years will not have been in vain. . . .
>
> The past and the present unite in the prayer that America will ever seek the ways of peace, and by her example at home and abroad speed the return of good will among men.

A year later, at the closing session of the Inter-American Conference for the Maintenance of Peace, at Buenos Aires, our Secretary of State, Mr. Cordell Hull, declared:

> Surely the time has come for every nation of the world to take inventory and to examine its own purposes and policies. Like individuals, nations must learn to forgive and forget the injuries done them by fellow nations. And in contemplating the future peace and welfare of humanity, we can and must speak in a spirit of entire friendliness to all nations and all peoples of today.

It would be well for us now that we have come so near the brink of a new international conflict to ponder those words more deeply and to put into more active practice those principles, which won so much acclaim at the time they were uttered, but which in the heat of untoward international "incidents" are in danger of being forgotten and repudiated—even by those who put them forth.

The *Panay* sinking was settled in a peaceful manner without resort to arms. Yet already there are new incidents, face-slapping and the like, and new stories are being seized upon by the selfish and the misguided to stir up hatred and the feeling that war is inevitable. Who knows how soon, in spite of the lesson we thought we had learned, the same type of subtle propaganda and appeal that drew us into the War to Make the World Safe for Democracy will precipitate us into a new World War, this time to Make the World Safe from Fascism—with even liberals and radicals, who cried out against the stupidity and the futility of the previous world conflict, deluding themselves into believing that this time the world can be saved only by war, and by preparation for war?

President Roosevelt in his Good Neighbor address said:

> The children in our schools, the young men and women passing through our colleges and into productive life have, unlike us, no direct knowledge of the meaning of war. They are not immune to the glamour of war, to the opportunities to escape from the drabness and worry of hard times at home in the glory and heroism of the arms factory and the battlefield.
>
> Fortunately, there is evidence on every hand that the youth of America, as a whole, is not trapped by that delusion. They know that elation and prosperity which may come from a new war must lead, for those who survive it, to economic and social collapse more sweeping than any we have experienced in the past . . .

In 1916 a President was reëlected because he promised to keep us out of war. Citizens who never before had cast a vote for the Democratic Party forsook party alignments and forgot political loyalties in order to record at the ballot box their desire for "peace at any price," their belief in non-intervention.

Then suddenly the policy of the government seemed to change. Peace advocates who refused to compromise with their ideals were arrested and imprisoned by the same administration whose repudiated peace principles they continued to sponsor. Our public schools, where campaigns were at the time being conducted to show through lectures and motion pictures the cruelty and inhumaneness in using feathers for women's hats, turned almost over night from talks against killing birds to campaigns for loyalty pledges and liberty loan subscriptions for the job of killing human beings.

The propaganda machine succeeded in getting us into the war but the very fact that the number of volunteers was so insufficient that a compulsory war conscription had to be resorted to showed that the majority of the people, at that time too, could not be trapped by war's glamour or glory, or convinced of its necessity.

None of the nations involved held referenda on the question of entering the World War. It is significant, however, that the one country that went directly to its people for an opinion on compulsory war service —the Commonwealth of Australia, whose constitution "provides permanent machinery for holding referenda"—voted in October, 1916, against "the proposal to give the government power to conscript citizens for overseas military service," by a majority of 72,476, with "82.75 per cent of the electors" participating. And evidently there were no regrets and no loss in prestige, for in December, 1917, "a modified proposal was submitted, involving power to conscript men for overseas service in sufficient numbers to make the total reinforcements (including volunteers) up to 7,000 per month"; but "this was rejected by a larger majority than the first, the voting being 1,015,159 in favor and 1,181,747 against" even a modified draft.[1]

The adoption of a constitutional amendment like the Ludlow War Referendum Bill to give those who will be called upon to do the fighting an opportunity to say whether they want to fight or not would do more to advance the democratic ideal and to keep the youth of America from being "trapped" into another foreign war than threatening to send out to the firing line the two or three million C.C.C. boys who, we fondly thought, were being trained in the development of habits of conservation and in peaceful occupational pursuits.

The twenty-one American Republics "have emphasized their will for peace," said Secretary Hull, "by manifesting their intention to pursue the economic policies which alone can afford the firm foundation for peace." We have been promoting more sympathetic relationships with our neighbors to the south; the big stick and military and naval occupation and intervention are being replaced by mutual trade agreements and cultural and educational interchange as a means of gaining respect and peaceful coöperation.

At an interesting three-day conference held this past December in Washington, D. C., under the auspices of the Inter-American Center of the George

1. *Australian Encyclopaedia*, Vol. II., edited by Arthur Wilberforce, Jose and Herbert James Carter, published by Angus and Robertson, Limited, Australia, 1926; pp. 377, 378.

Washington University on the subject *Pan Americanism—Its Justification and Future,* there were discussed ways and means by which ties of fellowship and good will have already been developed, and should be more fully extended, between ourselves and the Latin-American countries through the press and radio, through travel and education, legal and political relations, and commercial and financial enterprise.

As pointed out at the George Washington University conference by Mr. John B. Glenn, president of the Pan-American Trust Company, more satisfactory methods of commercial expansion through the stimulation of productive enterprise and the exchange of raw materials, agricultural products, and manufactured articles between our country and the Latin-American republics are being substituted for the pre-depression, post-war competitive practices of American bankers who imposed heavy loans upon Latin Americans with the result that "money was sometimes borrowed when it really was not needed and that borrowed money was sometimes spent for unproductive purposes." Our exports to and our imports from the Latin-American countries are definitely on the increase, it was stated optimistically—and illustrated with glowing figures—by Mr. Glenn and other speakers interested primarily in the business ends of Pan-Americanism. And "England, Germany, Japan, and Italy" who "have been our strong competitors in those markets," are for a number of reasons "losing ground to the United States" —fortunately for our trade and traders, perhaps.

If our economic policies are truly to rest on a "firm foundation for peace," must they not be free from the threat of new international economic rivalry and the exclusion of poorer nations, like Germany and Japan and Italy, from the trade upon which they are more dependent than we ourselves for foreign exchange and credits, for raw materials, for the maintenance or improvement of standards of living, even for their very existence?

The "recapture of world markets" for ourselves without consideration of the general world welfare is hardly compatible with neighborliness or conducive to genuine world peace. Let us consider human rights, as it were, above fishing rights in Alaskan waters.

The advocates of increased spending for war materials and the expansion of our military, naval, and air forces are in the habit of using the fire department as an analogy in their argument that preparedness for war is a safeguard of peace. But is this a true analogy? Fire departments are prepared with fire extinguishers and water hose—with equipment for putting out fires, not with combustibles like gasoline or matches or other things that are liable to start a blaze or make one burn more brightly. In fact, among the duties of city fire departments is the regular inspection of public and private buildings to see that fire hazards are eliminated, to prevent intentional, accidental, or spontaneous combustions.

Just as we have police departments in our towns and cities to protect us against thieves and murderers, it is argued, so we need united action and an international police force to insure ourselves against criminals and peace violators among the nations. But even the policeman on the street corner is beginning to realize that the so-called anti-social and delinquent are "have nots," deprived, maladjusted members of society who are in need of care rather than condemnation; and that the Boys' Club is a surer crime preventive and deterrent than the club, or the gun, which he carries with him on his beat!

The Good Neighbor, among nations as well as among individuals, goes forth with tokens of good will and friendship, not with show of guns or threat of force. Forgiveness and the good example comprise the finding of peaceful, friendly ways of eradicating antagonisms and eliminating underlying difficulties, instead of augmenting hostilities and suspicions through the spread of atrocity and boycott propaganda—or through building bigger and better armies and navies which may "scare" aggressors temporarily but which in the long run can result only in a new world cataclysm.

The Pacifist Movement in France*

CAMILLE DREVET

The great tragedy for French pacifists is that they are witnessing a repetition of the sacred alliance of 1914, an alliance in a form even more terrible than that of 1914. Before the war began, we knew nothing about such an alliance. There was opposition in the Chamber to the compulsory three-year military service and to the military appropriations. In France, as in other parts of the world, this opposition came especially from workers' parties. No unity was possible until after the August, 1914, invasion by the German army.

Today we see the Chamber voting monstrous war credits *unanimously,* we see former pacifists and Socialists combining with the Right to pass these appropriations. People who used to say "No national defense under the capitalist system" now say "Everything for national defense."

The attitude of the Socialists—their weakness, their irresponsibility—is beyond belief. But the attitude of the Communists is even worse; to defend the "democracies" and the Soviet Union, their ally, we must be strong. In lectures, newspapers, on billboards, they urge young men to be good soldiers. In election campaigns they tell the women again and again: "It is better to be the widow of a hero than the wife of a slacker, etc."

In short, by their demagogy and propaganda, they have succeeded in forcing the working class to take a position for imperialism, or rather for certain imperialist nations, for England, the United States, France, and Russia, and against Germany, Italy, and Japan.

In this way they have turned the masses from their true destiny which is to emancipate themselves, to free themselves from imperialism and from war.

This sudden reversal of policy, this complete abandonment of principle, where will it lead? Let us hope not to catastrophe! We are still, some millions of us, determined to continue the struggle.

*Translated by Lola Maverick Lloyd. Mme. Camille Drevet is the Secretary of the International Conference Against War and Militarism.

Before the Naval Affairs Committee

LOLA MAVERICK LLOYD

Through the courtesy of Congressman Ralph Church of my district, I was called as a witness before the Naval Affairs Committee of the House on February 16, where I testified in opposition to the administration bill that they are considering. The President asked for authorization of an $800,000,000 addition to our navy, already so enormously increased by the half billion that the House is appropriating according to a rather recent navy bill.

In H. R. 9218 a clause authorizes experimental tests to cost $15,000,000, and I heard Admiral Leahy refuse to divulge the nature of the tests to the committee, who seemed perfectly satisfied not to know. So Congress may hand over without a groan the tidy sum of $15,000,000 for naval purchases sight unseen, while the State Department has to run a year on $14,000,000. But I am not begging for that department since I have seen the Secretary of State using all his prestige to push us into the mad scramble for bigger armament.

I am begging for the same tidy sum in our uphill task of constructing adequate peace machinery for world affairs. And I hope I will have your help in making all the Congressmen listen to our plea for reviving American leadership in courageous experiment. My testimony follows:

In regard to the bill H. R. 9218, I want to express to you what I know is the opinion of the majority of American women. They would say, if they knew how to address you: Don't join the military nations in piling up armaments. Don't recommend this bill. Remember what our remaining in the naval race means to the people of the world. Beside impoverishment, the armament race means stirring up hatred and suspicion in many lands—an increase of tension and fear everywhere, and therefore a further slide toward world war. If we didn't know what world opinion is, a big navy might give us a temporary feeling of safety. But it will really mean the abandonment of all that enlightened international trend toward friendly coöperation which is the only possible basis of peace and prosperity in the long future. World coöperation is, in fact, our only immediate hope of bringing out of the present mess a decent life for our own generation. Don't destroy the very foundation of our hope. Hold back on this bill.

Since 1914 I have gone often to Geneva and have attended peace conferences in Europe as well as America, devoting a great part of my time to the furtherance of peace. Naval affairs in the technical sense are not my business, except that every least military preparation here has its repercussion abroad. No American can any longer safely remain isolated in thought. Foreign policy, for which our founding fathers created hardly any democratic machinery, has now become everybody's business. So let me remind you that in this complex modern world of interlocking international interests there is a foreign policy which can defend our national interests, without the use of a big navy.

The navy is not our first line of defense against enemies. Non-military safeguards come first and are far more effective. The good neighbor policy is in a general way our very best defense. If nations have grievances, they must by some means be fairly considered and removed, if possible. Failing in direct consultation, there is always the World Court. If the United States has an interest so vital in "orderly processes in international relationships" that we can contemplate intervention in the Orient to preserve them, our interest ought to spur us first to join the World Court and strengthen the orderly processes begun there. Our joining would safeguard our peace and world peace better than the whole military preparedness program now sweeping the world.

When wars occur outside of our borders, near or far, there are peace measures that should be undertaken before we think of taking sides, e. g., public offers of mediation and commissions of good will—open and democratic steps in the new technique which ignores traditional diplomacy and makes its appeal directly to the peoples. These steps of active good will neutrality are so much cheaper and so much safer than the naval race you are considering!

We ask you to leave the $800,000,000 in the Treasury for the pressing needs of our own people. But that other sum of $15,000,000 that you seem to be willing to devote to experimental tests without knowing what they are—that sum should indeed go to experiments in security. I ask it for a special kind of insurance, a new thing capable of insuring the safety of our sailors and of our soldiers and of us all. We need $15,000,000 for an exploration in the field of international non-military coöperation. Since the League of Nations has lost prestige from one cause and another, partly our fault, and since our own people want a more democratic form of world coöperation than the League ever was, let us spend a few millions inaugurating without delay machinery of a more perfect type. Make an experiment in world-wide security—collective, yes, but not military. Put $15,000,000 into the hands of a commission of men and women with international training or point of view and authorize them to proceed at once with the necessary preliminaries to an international convention of delegates chosen by all the peoples there are. Call them here to Washington to draw up a constitution for an all-inclusive Federation of Nations. The World Constitutional Convention must work out, with expert advice, the best machinery they can invent to take care of all those international affairs and problems for whose lack of solution in the past the people have repeatedly paid the penalty of war. War, up to our generation, has been a legal and perhaps inevitable recourse, but it has never brought permanent solution to the real problems of our race. It has never been a good machine at any time, and all peoples will rejoice to see it effectively outlawed by the establishment of better machinery.

Constitution-making need not be prolonged. The makers of our American Constitution took five months for a more difficult job. I say the thirteen colonies which united to form a nation under the Constitution had harder work than the World Constitution-makers need to have. The antipodes are in closer communication and more dependent on one another than our colonies were in the eighteenth century. We have wonderful new scientific discoveries that can keep all nations in close touch and replace the old traditional forms of international intercourse. Big international busi-

ness has set us the example in this field, ignoring national barriers. World affairs, too, must have up-to-date machinery if we want peaceful international relations.

An experiment to inaugurate this reign of reason can easily be made by the judicious use of $15,000,000. Its failure, which I think improbable, could only leave us where we now are—in the same utter confusion, with the old order falling to pieces and the little international law we have built up so laboriously losing its meaning and its authority. If our experiment succeeds and a constitution is evolved by such a World Convention as we can pay for with $15,000,000, it will be ratified, I believe, by enough grateful nations to bring it into effect in time to avoid any more world wars.

Isn't this a worthy experiment in a far more fruitful field than armaments? You will never be haunted by remorse if you make this experiment. We promise you for $15,000,000 the foundation of a structure to secure all nations in their legitimate pursuits. Future generations will bring it to perfection, but they cannot, unless we act in time now, survive with enough of our precious civilization preserved to build its foundation themselves. History waits for world unification—inspired again, and more effectively this time, by our great peace-loving nation—heir to the mingled civilization of all the nations.

I hope it lies in your power to recommend the calling of a World Constitutional Convention—if only as a measure of insurance for the American Navy.

A Substitute for the Ludlow Amendment

DAVID RHYS WILLIAMS

Many arguments have been made for and against the proposed Ludlow Amendment to the Constitution calling for a referendum on war. But there is one weakness in the proposal which both its advocates and opponents have apparently overlooked, and which I believe to be a valid objection.

My natural sympathies are with every movement which is calculated to keep this nation from being drawn into another world conflict. If I thought the Ludlow Amendment would help, I should be heartily in favor of it. But in my judgment this Amendment, if adopted, will prove to be nothing more than another scrap of paper like the recent Neutrality Law passed by Congress. The ineffectiveness of the Neutrality Law lies in the fact that there is no unmistakable definition of what constitutes a *state of war*. The whole thing is left to the judgment of the President of the United States. If he does not want to put the Neutrality Law into effect in the Sino-Japanese situation, all he needs to do is to take advantage of the fact that Japan has not formally declared war on China. As a matter of fact, this is what he has done.

The joker in the Ludlow Amendment which can be used to nullify its intended purpose is an innocent looking phrase, open to many interpretations. It is the following clause: "Except in case of invasion of the United States or its territorial possessions, and attack upon its citizens residing therein."

Who is to decide this point? Congress, of course. If Congress were in a mood to declare war it could easily declare it to be a defense against invasion, whatever the circumstances. Then what becomes of the War Referendum?

As a matter of fact, the President can wage war without a declaration from Congress at all, as in the case of the Expeditionary Force sent into Mexico in 1916, and again in the case of war against Russia in 1918. It seems to me that we have in the Ludlow Amendment another instance of a "scrap of paper"—an agreement that will not be reliable in a crisis. It seems to me that we shall be leaning on a broken reed, and that the Ludlow Amendment, instead of being *better* than *nothing*, is worse than nothing, because it will encourage the American people to feel a sense of security falsely. It is something like putting a gold brick away for a rainy day, or like taking out insurance in a company that is bankrupt.

As a substitute for the Ludlow Amendment, I make the following proposal, not with the idea that it is an ideal solution of the problem of peace and war by any means, but as *one* practical step toward such a solution.

Instead of a Referendum on War, I propose a *Referendum on Conscription.* The President of the United States could wage war without a declaration of war, but he could not wage an aggressive, unpopular war for very long without conscription. Suppose we had an Amendment as follows:

> No Act of Congress to conscript American citizens for any military purpose shall be legal without receiving the approval of a majority of the electorate in a popular referendum, and then only for the period of time specified in the referendum.

Here is something tangible and definite. This would leave the power to declare war in the hands of Congress, where it now lies. This would not unnecessarily handicap the President of the United States in his conduct of our foreign affairs. This would not prevent him or Congress from taking immediate steps to repel any threatened invasion of this country because the President would have at his disposal the standing army of the country, the navy, and the air force, and he could call for volunteers. Surely if the war were one of genuine defense against invasion, there would be enough volunteers rising to the aid of the country to take care of any conceivable emergency.

If conscription were found necessary, this would be reason enough for Congress and the President to submit their case directly to the people for approval or disapproval. There is one point on which the average citizen in a democracy should be consulted as an expert. He may not be an expert when it comes to military tactics or international diplomacy, but when it comes to killing or being killed for a cause, he may be presumed to know more than any one else whether the proposed cause is worthy of the surrender of his own life or his taking another's. Without this elementary right, it seems to me that no democracy is quite worthy of the name.

If a government is afraid to consult its citizens be-

fore drafting them to fight in a war, how does such a government differ in substance from a dictatorship or an absolute monarchy?

An honest government, truly representative, with clean hands and a high purpose, would have nothing to fear from a popular referendum on this matter. A dishonest government, with unclean hands, out of step with the people, ought to have something to fear, ought to have its way blocked by being denied the right to force its citizens to fight.

The act of conscription, unlike the act of invasion, is capable of exact definition, and any violation of such a law could be challenged by the individual citizen in open court with reasonable hope of being sustained.

A Referendum on Conscription would not hinder either the President or the Congress in the reasonable execution of their duties, would not take any expert questions out of the hands of experts, *would* permit an emergency defense of the nation, but at the same time would tend to keep this country from embarking on some wild chauvinistic excursion into wholesale slaughter and disaster.

Is not such an amendment a necessary supplement to our present system of checks and balances?

Arms of the Law

O. A. HAMMAND

One day in the City of Chicago, Public Enemy No. 1 and the Woman in Red ducked into the side door of a movie show to see a gangster picture. The gentleman who was about to be made the goat was then decoyed out in front where he was awaited by a gang of twenty-seven G-men with automatics and machine-guns. The lady who acted as stool-pigeon alleged that it was all fixed up with the G-men that they would prevent her from being kicked out of the country on an immorality charge. The little group of officers who were to become the residuary legatees of this clandestine gathering were all set for action. This is a beautiful kind of a triangle. One crook double-crossing another crook, all with the alleged collusion of the guardians of the law. But at no place does a judge or jury come into the affair.

I have no particular criticism of the trial of a case; that is not the point. The judge may preside and make decisions but he does not decide what cases shall be tried. The real decision is left for some one else to make. There are several stages in the procedure of prosecution, all of which have to operate in order to get the case into court. The crime must be discovered, a charge filed, a defendant detected, arrested, indicted, and brought into court for trial. If any step fails, there is no trial, and therefore no chance for the court to pass on the guilt or the innocence of the accused.

And who is it that first comes into contact with the violator of the law? It is the policeman, the marshal, the sheriff, the State or Federal agent. He does not contact the criminal in open court with everybody present, but on the street, or on a lonely road at night, or in an out-of-the-way place. Who knows what is said and done, or what kind of a bargain is struck at that time. Does he treat every one courteously and consider carefully before he makes an arrest? Does he realize that the arrest of a citizen of the United States is a serious thing? Is he always gentle and humane in his treatment of a suspect after he has made an arrest?

For many years there have been too many cases of the third degree. It does not follow that all officers are guilty of such abuses or that a large part of them do such things, yet these abuses are common and frequent. Of course, the officer who does such things is unworthy of his job but that does not help at all. At this point there is something for the judge to do, which no other person has the knowledge to do or the authority to do. He should give the peace officers instructions as to the scope of their duties and see that those duties are performed in a legal and orderly way. The judge should give searching scrutiny and exclude all evidence obtained by third degree methods and hold any peace officer strictly accountable for the abuse of his authority. It is the business of the peace officer to protect the innocent as well as to detect the guilty.

There is a realm of activity which is outside and beyond the jurisdiction of the court. I refer to the practice now carried on by the posse, police, deputies, sheriffs, State and Federal agents, and vigilantes, who pursue criminals, or any whom they assume to be criminals, and shoot them down with automatics and machine-guns. That is not the way to try a criminal case. Too much of the jurisdiction of the court has already been taken over to the roadside and the cornfields.

Drives against crime cannot succeed and are not expected to succeed. On their face they imply only a sporadic and periodic effort with little desire to succeed. There is a drive on one crime, then on another. There is a drive on the bootlegger or the burglar, the bank robber or the kidnapper, but they accomplish nothing. It requires honest, intelligent, and sustained effort to obtain results. We shall not get anywhere by "combing the city" and picking up everybody who ever had any conflict with the police, dragging them off to jail, holding them for investigation, and, when nothing is found "on them," just letting them go. It is an outrage to arrest any innocent person unless there are reasonable grounds for his apprehension. The chance that he might be guilty or might know something about the crime is not sufficient. The absence of law is anarchy but the abuse of law is tyranny. Desperate remedies are dangerous remedies, and lawlessness begets lawlessness.

It may be possible to catch crooks by employing crooks, sneaks, and spies, but what good does it do to catch one crook if we produce another to take his place? "A tip from the underworld" indicates a bond, an understanding and friendship with the underworld; that some one is "in cahoots" with the underworld and,

of course, has the protection of the underworld. On August 26, 1933, Will Irwin said, "When Kayo Elkins, gunman and bootleg guard of Boston, died mysteriously of gunshot wounds, this was his newspaper obituary: 'Arrested seventy-two times, he never spent a night in jail.'" Our problem is not to catch any particular criminal or any particular number of criminals, but to stop the manufacture of criminals and prevent the organization of gangs, and to clean up the situation. There is no such thing as the elimination of the underworld so long as we cultivate and protect the underworld. It is time that the rough stuff in police practices and the use of police procedure instead of judicial procedure should be discontinued. Trials by judges and juries in open court are better than trials by tear gas and machine guns.

Study Table

What Is Ahead of Us?

WHAT IS AHEAD OF US? *By G. D. H. Cole, Sir Arthus Salter, Wickham Steed, Sidney Webb, P.M.S. Blackett, Lancelot Hogben.* 192 *pp. New York: The Macmillan Company.* $2.00.

Having published the lectures of their annual series only two or three times since the first in 1889, the Fabians cannot be lauded overmuch for their decision to print again and give the world the timely volume, *What Is Ahead of Us?*

Here G. D. H. Cole, attempting an answer to the question, "Can Capitalism Survive?", strikes the keynote of the lectures when he maintains, in aphoristic prose, that, since democratic capitalism reverts in crises automatically to fascist capitalism, and that, since Fascism "is better able to make the poor man who is a little better off maintain the poor man who is a little worse off, without making any call upon the rich," capitalism will collapse only because it cannot keep the peace. World Fascism means for Cole a state of barbarism, or worse; and, hence, "unless we act speedily, in the spirit of democratic unity against the devilish forces that have been let loose on the world, I fear greatly that we may act too late."

Sir Arthur Salter—"Economic Nationalism: Can It Continue?"—would meet the fascist threat with a restoration of world trade; a restoration, however, which takes cognizance of the fact of the impossibility of returning to the old time gold standard and of doing away with tariffs. William Steed—"Dictatorships: What Next?"—resentful, as are all the lecturers, over the tacit encouragement given the fascist powers by the British Nationalist government's policy of pacifism and withdrawal, calls for the showing of a strong hand: "What next? Inevitable war, unutterable woe, if we are not true to ourselves and do not stand for those principles of human liberty which have made us great."

Sidney Webb—"The Future of Soviet Communism"—with his usual comprehensive and informative manner, answers the current red-baiting myths about Russia and Communism, and concludes: ". . . the U. S. S. R. stands out from every other country as supremely the Land of Hope." Answering the question, "The Next War: Can It Be Avoided?" P. M. S. Blackett, certain that Hitler will dominate Europe unless stopped by force, calls, as do several other lecturers, for a British counterpart of the French People's Front, and a mutual assistance pact with the U. S. S. R. But by far the most startling of the lectures is that of L. Hogben, "Planning for Human Survival," in which he mightily maintains that extinction is the future for the civilized human being unless Socialism can avoid the biological failure of capitalism. And he is not sure that Socialism can or will: ". . . if Socialists cannot think of anything better than the Worker's Flats in Vienna, we should be thankful that Dolfuss destroyed them before they had built sterility into the structure of a Socialist Society."

R. LESTER MONDALE

Toward International Good Will

SOME SPANISH-AMERICAN POETS. *Translated by Alice Stone Blackwell, with an introduction and notes by Isaac Goldberg.* 559 *pp. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.* $1.50.

When war clouds are marching up in grim phalanxes across the horizons of the world, it is encouraging to open this great book that Alice Stone Blackwell has given us and to realize that such gestures toward international good will and interracial understanding are being made.

Here we have the passionate voices of eighty different poets in nineteen different lands. On the right-hand side of the page appears the Spanish poem, on the left Miss Blackwell's able translation, usually in rhymed metrical or blank verse.

This book should do much to acquaint the poetry-lovers of North America with the rich poetic harvest being garnered in the poetic fields of our southern neighbors and to strengthen the faith of the passionate few who carry the banner for poetry in the United States. Such strengthening is needed here, where poetry is the most neglected and least respected of all the arts.

In a most interesting preface Miss Blackwell tells of the honors paid poets in Latin America. In Colombia, for instance, poetry is a popular national art. The same glory is accorded the poet there as is given here to a Robert Taylor or a Max Schmeling. The enthusiasm at public poetry readings is like that evidenced by football fans at an Army and Navy game. Imagine many cheering thousands flocking to Hollywood Bowl to hear Carl Sandburg!

South Americans have made their poetry a vocal art. Perhaps the emphasis now being given to verse speaking choirs in our country by Miss Cecile de Banke, of Wellesley College, and others may help restore poetry to its natural place in our national life. In so far as it is the plaything of a few "ivory tower" esthetes, it remains a sickly plant. Fortunately we are beginning to do as the South Americans do: take our poetry out of anemic, academic cloisters to the people themselves in the health-giving sunshine of democracy.

In an interesting foreword Isaac Goldberg outlines some of the developments in Spanish-American poetry. Of especial interest are his remarks

on women poets, whose work is often "virile" and "robust" as well as "delicate" and "mystic." As yet, the preface tells us, the South has no Whitman, no Amy Lowell and no Carl Sandburg or other modernist experimenters in form. However, it does have poets of social revolt, and these poets have been able to play a far greater role on the political stage than our poets here have achieved. We do have our poets of social advance. But our economics-minded humanitarians offer them shamefully scanty support. Instead they add their praises in conventional chorus to the few overrated, spiritually bankrupt poetic "stars," whose press agents are well rewarded for their ballyhoo.

In this volume we find the work of those poets considered by their own countrymen to be the greatest: Ruben Dario of Nicaragua, Amado Nervo of Mexico, Gabriela Mistral of Chile, José Santos Chocano of Peru, who writes so delightfully,

"In my child's curls I always have the sun,
The moon in my dear mother's silver hair."

An appendix with illuminating comments on the authors represented in this collection forms a valuable asset. The whole volume is a scholarly achievement.

Miss Blackwell has performed a great work on behalf of poetry in North and South America. To her should go the unbounded gratitude of all lovers of culture and all believers in international harmony and in those spiritual laws of which Ralph Cheyney writes:

"For Life has but a single Face
Though a million million hands."

LUCIA TRENT.

The Statesmanship of Peace

SWORDS OR PLOWSHARES? *By Earl Cranston.* 256 *pp. New York: Abingdon Press.* $2.00.

As one wager of peace to all our fellow peace wagers we say, "You surely must add this big gun to your arsenal." We thought we knew the recent peace literature rather well; but let us state it emphatically,—to our knowledge there is no other volume that makes the approach and tackles the war machine from the angle used by Dr. Cranston. So far as we know, this volume is unique in that it traces the history of Europe partially and briefly, but America in rich detail to prove that peace and not war has brought the gains of which nationals are proud.

Chapter I traces the "Old World Dreams of Unity and Peace" from Isaiah of Jerusalem through Mo Ti, Jesus, Lactantius, et al., to Erasmus of Rotterdam. In Chapter II "Modern Europe Gropes Toward Internationalism" from the Treaty of Westphalia, in 1648, to Versailles, in 1919. The next five chapters give us United States history as a peace-waging history teacher might present it. This country's various wars, including the debacle of the 1917-18 entanglement, are sketched with a knowing hand. Little was ever gained by war, and what may be thought to have been gained through resort to arms might have been attained by peaceful methods far easier and without the terrible aftermath of every insane outburst of war. Chapter VI on "America's Debt to Peace" is masterly. Peace has given our land most of all we prize in her.

There will be many not quite so sure of Dr. Cranston's thesis that Britain and America must plan together as leaders toward the sunrise of a new day; but our author makes a good case. He concludes with a chapter on "Where the Nation Stands Today," and another on "Where the Individual Stands Today." At times he does seem to be rather over-enthusiastic, inferring more from certain sinister situations than is warranted, but he has real vision in regard to the possibilities of peace. A good book for the discouraged!

GEORGE MAYCHIN STOCKDALE

War in Wonderland

The world wants peace; the world prepares for war.

Practical pacifists are visionaries; timorous militarists are idealists.

Anyone may urge war in peace time; no one may propose peace in war time.

Every nation would be more secure without armaments; every nation increases its armaments.

War is waged to obtain economic security; war destroys economic security.

Collective security is security uncollected.

No international conference has ever discussed universal total disarmament which would be to the mutual advantage of all.

Aggression is denounced by law-abiding nations, but there is no international law which makes aggression a crime.

All nations have agreed to wage only defensive wars; every nation may determine which wars are defensive.

Experience having shown that battleships are of little use and can be destroyed readily by bombing planes, the nations are building more battleships.

Battleships would be as useful if made in Hollywood, provided they were listed in naval registers.

Battleships of 35,000 tons are the largest practicable, but if Japan builds 43,000-ton battleships, the United States will build still larger.

Admiral Sims says battleships are worthless for defense; we are building more battleships for defense only.

The United States has asked Japan to reveal the secrets it would give its life's blood to conceal.

To avenge minor losses in China, the United States may spend billions of dollars in a war with Japan.

Though it is admitted that the United States navy could not defeat Japan in its own waters, we are increasing our navy to prevent Japan from attacking our shores.

If we captured Japan, we would not keep it. If we imposed an indemnity, they would not pay it.

Our new naval program is for defense only, defense of our possessions. The Philippines are our possessions.

We are about to give up the Philippines, but will sacrifice our last man and last dollar to retain them if Japan attacks.

Great Britain has an agreement for security with the United States; the United States has no such agreement with Great Britain.

The atrocities of the last war will be patriotic acts in the next.

If democracies, imperialists, and aggressors fight to a finish, all peoples will be so poor that they will turn to Communism or Fascism, to prevent which the war is to be fought.

WILLIAM FLOYD.

Correspondence

In Behalf of World Government

Editor of UNITY:

Although the organized American peace movement is largely in the hands of women, only two women have testified so far during the hearings on the Naval Appropriations Bill in the Naval Affairs Committee of the House. They were Miss Jeanette Rankin and Mrs. Lola Maverick Lloyd. Mrs. Lloyd's statement received all too little attention in the press, although hers was the only constructive counter-proposal to military methods of defense presented at the hearings.

In the present discussion as to the method of keeping the United States out of war usually two alternatives only are offered to the American people. Of the first, isolation, we have always dreamed fondly since we became a nation, but never realized even in the horse-and-buggy era when it took weeks to reach our shores from any direction. It is reasonably safe to assume that what we could not achieve in our infancy, we shall certainly not achieve in this era of speedy and often instant communication. It is also a question whether isolation, were it possible, would be any more beneficial to our development than it was to China, hidden behind the Great Wall.

The second alternative is now vaguely bundled into uncertain phrases, such as international coöperation, collective security, or the latest, "parallel action." In every case this type of security is sought by the use of armed force. In an oversimplified way its advocates divide the world into parts labeled democracies and Fascist nations. When carefully examined, we find the democracies themselves so near the verge of Fascism that only a crusade to maintain collective security by force of arms is needed to achieve the complete militarization of the world with the subsequent destruction of all civil and intellectual rights and thereby also of what we are pleased to call civilization.

That there is a third course, leadership in which should be eminently the task of the United States, was startlingly presented by Mrs. Lloyd in her testimony.*

The application of Mrs. Lloyd's proposal involves an experiment in non-military defense in logical accord with the evolutionary development of the world's political growth. Those who increasingly realize that the world's problems cannot be patched up locally with a plaster here and an injection there are beginning to urge the immediate calling of a World Constitutional Convention. Such a Convention should examine the whole basis of world government and draw up a Constitution to be submitted for the ratification of the peoples of the whole world.

The most desirable form of such a super-government would surely be an all-inclusive, democratic Federation of Nations on the model of the United States of America. The American method has been followed to a certain extent in various parts of the world where the sovereignty of groups of individual states has been lodged in federal governments. Some of the drafters of modern constitutions (the Chinese, Spanish, Weimar, Turkish, etc.), are doubtless still alive and with the help of theoretical experts could serve in an advisory capacity to a World Constitutional Convention, democratically elected by a uniform and simple process of voting.

This proposal certainly places before Americans a third choice in methods of national defense. It points out that insanity is not the best defense against insanity as those who advocate war to stop war actually propose. It asks Americans to exercise that type of leadership in world political organization to which we owe our own form of federal government. The real obstruction to the application of this plan is not the existence of militaristic dictatorships (they could not afford to oppose it if the so-called democracies sincerely wanted it), but the lack of constructive leadership in the militaristic democracies.

Therefore, the real question facing the American people today is this: Shall we lead the nations in applying to the whole world the next logical step in political organization of the type we have shown to be successful, in time to prevent the total destruction of present-day civilization by its own scientifically perfected armaments? If this course is presented fairly to the American people, I am sure their answer will be that of overwhelming approval.

EDITH WYNNER.

New York City.

*See Page 9.

Three Notable Women

Editor of UNITY:

I have been spending a couple of weeks in Palo Alto, California. Recently I went to the Public Library to see an unusual exhibit occasioned by the birthday of Susan B. Anthony. This was presented to the public gaze by that remarkable citizen of Palo Alto, Alice Park, a tireless champion of peace, a friend of children, and of the animal world which must daily sing her praises. This Susan B. Anthony exhibit had just enough of dates and pictures and quotations and old badges to emphasize that this first of the suffragette crusaders spoke before every Congress from 1869 to 1906. She was a woman who changed the mind of the nation.

On this same day I received a letter from another woman, Alice Stone Blackwell, of Cambridge, Massachusetts. She also is a notable champion of good causes—much like her sister in Palo Alto. We all know that she is the daughter of Lucy Stone, who was one of the first to stand for equal rights for women in education, politics, and society. There is none greater than Lucy Stone! All will deeply regret that Miss Blackwell must go through the rest of her days without her eyesight. She writes that she must now learn to find enjoyment "from my eyebrows up," as someone long ago advised everybody to do.

On this same day I also received a letter from Geneva, Switzerland. It came from that world champion of equal rights, Gertrude Baer, who is Joint Chairman of the World's Congress of Women, to be held in France or Czechoslovakia at Eastertime. This notable woman hopes that "the time is ripe for a world-wide women's crusade to abolish war." "I believe," she adds, "that women can abolish war; men will not."

I lift my hat to these three women, Alice Park, of Palo Alto; Alice Stone Blackwell, of Cambridge; and Gertrude Baer, of Geneva.

SYDNEY STRONG.

Seattle, Washington.

Coöperation

Editor of UNITY:

The outstanding article on the Coöperatives, in the February 7th issue of UNITY, thrilled me! Now I wonder if you would care to consider putting a little notice in an issue to the effect that any one desiring information on the Coöperative Movement should write direct to The Coöperative League, 167 West 12th Street, New York City. This might save a lot of correspondence with the UNITY office.

H. POSNER.

Rochester, N. Y.

Mr. Justice Black

Editor of UNITY:

It seems to me that the joke is on the "liberals" just now since Justice Black has proved to be the whitest member of the Supreme Court in respect to the dirtiest piece of Supreme Court legislation in the last seventy years, the raping of the Fourteenth Amendment. I cannot but laugh.

ROBERT WHITAKER.

Los Gatos, California.

Send UNITY to a new reader
Trial subscription of.....

6 MONTHS for $1.00

A Journal of Free and Critical Opinion

UNITY
700 Oakwood Boulevard
Chicago

For the enclosed dollar, send UNITY as a gift, for a trial period of six months to

Name .....

Street .....

City ..... State.....

The Field

(*Continued from page 2*)

meet in February to discuss amendments submitted by various bodies. It is on the lines of the famous 1933 Convention for the protection of certain categories but contains clauses which suggest a further advance in humanitarian understanding.

Jewish Refugees

Unhappily this problem seems to grow more and more difficult of any right solution. There is a continuous trickle of men and women from Germany who, to avoid the shocking conditions imposed upon them, are able to find their way out.

In Poland the situation is extremely anxious. Enormous numbers face starvation, poverty, and persecution in that country if the feeling against Jews should harden. Even with an enlightened administration the poverty question appears nearly insoluble. The latest news from Roumania seems to indicate that an attack is to be made upon Jews in that country, in which case there will be attempts at a new exodus. But where can the unhappy victims go? In Austria there does not appear to be much change in the attitude towards the Jews, but it may only be that we hear less because less news gets out.

When will all these countries realize what reserves of intellectual and spiritual strength they are losing through driving out the Children of Israel?

Abyssinian Refugees

It has been stated that there are some 16,000 of these who have fled to surrounding territories in Africa and that they are living in great distress and poverty. It is hoped that they will be allowed to remain and cultivate the ground where they are, and to move about within the territories in order to provide themselves with the possibility of food. A statement lately appeared in the British press that the British Government was making itself responsible for expenses of maintenance of Abyssinian refugees in British territory.

Spanish Refugees

The problem of Spanish refugees outside and inside Spain does not appear to worry governments much, but the French Government has spent nearly half a million pounds in caring for those who fled to France, before insisting on their returning to Spain. The accounts given of refugee conditions in Spain itself, in spite of the heroic efforts made by the Government to deal with them, are really horrifying. When one thinks of the hundreds of thousands of children shivering and starving in towns and villages which have no adequate means of dealing with them and many of which have surprise bombardments from the air as an added complication, one marvels at the courage of the Spaniards, but serious fears for the future cannot be avoided.

Chinese Refugees

Of all the dreadful suffering of refugees in China, perhaps the fate of the Russian refugees there may be the worst, for they have no protection of any kind. The tales of masses of Chinese men, women and children flying before aerial bombardment to villages which have no means of feeding them (and anyone who knows what the normal poverty of a Chinese village is will realize that even Chinese hospitality cannot share what is not there) are alike in every part of the world where man's inhumanity to man increases with his power to destroy.

Masses of food, clothing and medicaments continue to be sent, but they can only be a drop in the ocean of suffering.

One Gleam of Light

In all the refugee question there seems only one gleam of light. In many countries public opinion seems at last to begin to take an interest in it. The International Labor Office is convening a technical Conference of Experts to study international coöperation with regard to emigration for settlement. The Royal Institute of International Affairs, London, has set up a Refugee Survey, directed by Sir John Hope Simpson and France has organized the "Institut d'Histoire de l'Emigration politique contemporaine," of which M. de Lavailles-Labathet, who drew up the famous refugee convention of 1933 is President. All of which proves that an acknowledged problem exists which it is the duty of such civilization as we have, to solve.

Pax International.

To the "Men Who Matter"

Extract from a Letter written by the late Canon "Dick" Sheppard, leader of the pacifist movement in Great Britain, shortly before his recent death.

"For close on two thousands of years we have been vowing allegiance to Christ and trying to escape the practical consequences of his teaching. We have been shutting Him up in churches and behaving in daily life and politics and international relations as if He did not exist.

"The time has come when we must let Him out of the churches. Another war might well mean the end of Christian civilization on this earth and all that that civilization has achieved. And it seems to me that the only hope of avoiding war is to accept Christianity as a way of life, not only in our private affairs, but in all public and international contacts.

"In other words, the nations must stop thinking about selfish interests and about prestige, must put suspicion and fear behind them, and see what confidence and friendliness and good will can achieve. I know you are going to reply that this is impracticable—that human nature being as it is, war is always a possibility, and it is your duty to guard against it.

"I tell you, gentlemen, that human nature is better than you think. It is not the peoples over whom you rule that stand in the way of peace—it is yourselves and your fear. You are still living in the darkness of the past and in the terror of darkness; they are stretching out eager hands toward the light of the future.

"Is not this new temper of theirs your opportunity? You have it in your power today, if you will renounce war, and do it in earnest and without reservation, to usher in a new era. You have it in your power to write 'finis' to the old jealousies and the ancient quarrels. You have it in your power to turn the world's steps into the paths of peace, paths which will lead humanity to a new richness and fullness of life.

"Gentlemen, you may win, if you will, a fame greater than any conqueror has achieved, and, what is still more worthy of ambition, the blessings of generations still unborn. But even if you fail to rise to the height of this great opportunity, I do not despair. There can be no war if the peoples *will* peace. And there is a wind of God blowing through the minds of men today that, I believe, will prove fatal to war.

"And so, gentlemen, I sign myself, in so far as my conscience permits.

"Your obedient servant,

DICK SHEPPARD."

The Harriet Wells Scholarship

Under the Auspices of the English-Speaking Union, Summer of 1938

For several years a traveling scholarship has been given to an American teacher (or member of a kindred profession) by the Education Committee of the English-Speaking Union of the United States to enable the recipient to visit Great Britain under the auspices of this national American society and as the guest of its sister society, the English-Speaking Union of the British Empire. The award has recently been named the "Harriet Wells Scholarship" in honor of Mrs. Thomas B. Wells, the original organizer of the educational work of the E. S. U. and the Chairman of the Education Committee from its formation until 1931, since when she has lived abroad. The traveling scholarships are an activity in which Mrs. Wells has always taken a particular interest.

The person selected will spend a month in Great Britain, sailing in time to report in London in June or early

(*Continued on page 16*)

The Progressive

Regular Price $2.00 Per Year

A national weekly newspaper founded in 1909 by the late Robt. M. La Follette, Sr.—an unusual periodical. No advertising accepted.

SECRET NEWS

WITHHELD FROM ADVERTISING-SUBSIDIZED NEWSPAPERS

Accurate news stories of political corruption, bribery in business and in politics, atrocities committed in the strife between organized labor and capital. These are some of the startling revelations to appear in the next few issues.

Special Offer 20 Weeks for 50c

The Progressive will reveal sensational information that powerful political and business interests wish to withhold from the public.

WAR BOOK FREE

Send 50c for a 20-weeks trial subscription. You will also receive the 30-page booklet, "LET'S KEEP OUT OF WAR," by Robert M. La Follette Sr.—instructive—thrilling—and containing all the reasons why the United States should not enter into any foreign war.

Address THE PROGRESSIVE, Dept. A, Madison, Wis.

The Field

(*Continued from page* 15)

July. The tenure of the scholarship will expire upon completion of a month's visit, and the recipient will then be free to go his own way and return when he wishes.

The scholarship is open to both men and women between the ages of twenty-one and forty-five who are teachers, librarians, social workers, or graduate students, and who reside within a radius of about 200 miles of Chicago.

The scholarship is one of $250, a sum estimated to cover about half the total expenses, including ocean transportation, passport and visa, travel from point to point (which will not amount to a great deal), and such incidentals as taxicabs, laundry, and gratuities.

During the month the scholar will be provided with complete hospitality by the British society, often as a guest in private homes. He will also be otherwise entertained and enabled to see English life not as a tourist but under the exceptional and very pleasant conditions thus provided. Opportunity will be given to visit schools or other institutions according to the interests of the visitor. His time will probably be divided between half a dozen sections, such as London, Stratford, Oxford, Edinburgh, and other places.

The selection of the scholar will be made carefully from among qualified candidates, preference being given to those who have not previously visited England. The chief qualifications are high professional standing, good personality, active interest in this opportunity, and the likelihood that he will benefit from the experience.

He will be expected on his return to make a report to the Education Committee, and to speak as occasion offers on his visit to Great Britain, so that the influence of the award shall be as far-reaching as possible.

Application blanks may be secured from the Chicago Branch office, 360 N. Michigan Ave., Chicago, Illinois. Applicants should fill out the blank and, in addition, should write a letter to the Secretary of the Education Committee of the English-Speaking Union, in care of Mrs. M. Ogden West, Executive Secretary, English-Speaking Union, Chicago Branch, 360 N. Michigan, No. 802, Chicago, Illinois giving the main facts of their past experience and present work, their special interests and reasons for wishing to visit Great Britain in this way. Personal interviews of candidates will take place *in Chicago* about the first of April. Applications close March 19, 1938.

Anti-War Movement in Japan

The existence of an anti-war movement in Japan has been repeatedly reported by the *China Weekly Review*. Proof of this is seen in the leaflets found at Shanghai, in the Japanese navy, and on the bodies of dead Japanese soldiers, which were issued by Japan's Peace League, the Farmers' League, the Ex-Servicemen's Corps, and other organizations, all opposed to the war in China. The Japanese navy has already arrested twenty sailors and sent them back to face firing squads.

The type of anti-war propaganda being spread is also significant. One leaflet declares that the present war is waged by Japanese war lords, finance barons, and the nobility in the hope of reaping selfish gains. "The militarists," it continues, "desire to seize political power, the finance leaders attempt to monopolize Japan's financial market, while the nobility wants to overthrow His Imperial Majesty. To realize their personal and class ambitions, they are driving Japan's youthful soldiers to be slaughtered."

Another leaflet distributed by the so-called Anti-War Movement of the Japanese Young Men, which was found in the pockets of dead Japanese soldiers, lists as reasons for opposing the war:

1. We should not fight for the military and financiers as slaves;

2. Already 200,000 men have been killed since the Mukden Incident of 1931;

3. There is no reason to sacrifice more, since China is not our enemy but the militarists are.

It is well known that the Japanese army and navy have been one of the sources of "anti-capitalist" propaganda. The young recruits, coming from circumstances of extreme hardship and poverty, were readily roused against capitalism and turned toward military fascism. These leaflets, if genuine, seem to indicate that the pro-military part of this education was not entirely successful. It may be, of course, that the leaflets were issued and spread by the Chinese.

—*Nofrontier News Service.*

To Be Informed on World Events

READ

"WORLD EVENTS"

A Pocket Periodical for Students of International Affairs

Lively, good humored, crisp, never dull, but packed with information not to be found anywhere else. News from a special staff of correspondents (over 150) throughout the globe. "WORLD EVENTS" is the answer to the problem of how to get behind the headlines—with important *uncensored* items from Tokyo, Shanghai, Madrid, London, Rome, Washington—everywhere! Purposely brief and cheap. Published on the 1st and 15th of each month from October to June inclusive.

In our files are hundreds of spontaneous letters of appreciation from teachers, farmers, housewives, ministers, businessmen and students. Among our readers are Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt, Rabbi Stephen S. Wise, Upton Close, Prof. Halford E. Luccock, Dr. Grover Clark, Publisher Lincoln Schuster, Dr. Harry Overstreet, President Ernest H. Wilkins of Oberlin College, Dr. Ulyss S. Mitchell of the American Baptist Publication Society, and countless other well-known men and women.

ONLY 50c A YEAR

Order at once from World Events, Wilton, Conn.